

Advertisements not under \$100
will be published until the 1st of
October. Professional notices, legal
and other advertisements, published
at a liberal rate. Advertisements
for the sale of real estate, at a
double the usual price. Letters to
the Publisher, to insure attention to
them, should be addressed to the
Editor. Advertising candidates for
District and State offices \$10.
The cost of this office must be paid
in advance.
We are prepared to do any work
with neatness and dispatch, and
they can be done in any printing
office.

LETTER OF GEN. CASS TO MR. NICHOLSON ON THE WILMOT PROVISION.

WASHINGTON, Dec. 21, 1847.

Dear Sir—I have received your letter, and shall answer it as frankly as it was written.

You ask me whether I am in favor of the acquisition of Mexican territory and what are my sentiments with regard to the Wilmot Provision.

I have so often and so explicitly stated my views of the first question, in the Senate, that it seems almost unnecessary to repeat them here. As you request it, however, I shall briefly give them.

I think, then, that no power should be granted to Mexico, till a reasonable indemnity is obtained for the injuries which she has done us. The territory of a nation is its property, and its right to it is a subject of executive consideration.

There the Constitution has placed it, and there I am willing to leave it; not only because I have full confidence in its judicious exercise, but because in the ever varying circumstances of a war, it would be indiscreet, by a public declaration, to commit the country to any line of indemnity, which might otherwise be prolonged, as the

justice of the enemy prolongs the contest, with the loss of blood and treasure.

It appears to me that the kind of metaphysical argument, which would reject all indemnity at the close of a bloody and expensive war, brought on by a direct attack upon our troops by the enemy, and preceded by a succession of unjust acts for a series of years, is an unworthy of the age in which we live, as it is revolting to the common sense and practice of mankind.

It would conduce but little to our future security, or indeed to our present reputation to declare that we repudiate all expectation of compensation from the Mexican government and are fighting, not for any practical result, but for some vague, perhaps philanthropic object, which escapes my penetration, and must be defined by those who assume this new principle of national intercommunication.

All wars are to be deprecated, as well by the statesman, as by the philanthropist. They are great evils, but there are greater evils than these, and submission to injustice is among them. The nation which should refuse to defend its rights and its honor when assailed, would soon have neither to defend; and when driven to war, it is not by professions of magnanimity, or declarations of non-resistance, that it can be taught a lesson of forbearance—the strongest security for permanent peace. We are at war with Mexico, and its vigorous prosecution is the surest means of its speedy termination and ample indemnity the surest guaranty against the recurrence of such injustice as provoked it.

The Wilmot Provision has been before the country some time. It has been repeatedly discussed in Congress, and by the public press. I am strongly impressed with the opinion, that a great change has been going on in the public mind upon this subject—in my own as well as others; and that doubts are resolving themselves into convictions, that the principles it involves should be kept out of the national legislature and left to the people of the confederacy in their respective local governments.

The whole subject is a comprehensive one, and limited of important consequences. It would be ill-timed to discuss it here. I shall not assume that responsible task but shall confine myself to such general views as are necessary to the fair exhibition of my opinions.

We may well regret the existence of slavery in the Southern States, and wish that it had been saved from its introduction. But there it is, and not by the act of the present generation; and we must deal with it as a great practical question, involving the most momentous consequences.

We have neither the right nor the power to touch it where it exists; and if we had both, their exercise, by any means heretofore suggested, might lead to results which no wise man would willingly encounter and which no good man could contemplate without anxiety.

The theory of our government presupposes, that its various members have reserved to themselves the regulation of all subjects relating to what may be termed their internal policy. They are sovereign within their boundaries, except in those cases where they have surrendered to the general government a portion of their rights, in order to give effect to the objects of the Union, whether these concern foreign nations or the several States themselves. Local institutions, if I may so speak, whether they have reference to slavery or to any other relations, domestic or public, are left to local authority, either original or derivative. Congress has no right to say, that there shall be slavery in New York, or that there shall be no slavery in Georgia; nor is there any other human power, but the people of those States respectively, which can change the relations existing therein; and they can say, if they will, "We will have slavery in the former and we will abolish it in the latter."

In various respects the Territories differ from the States. Some of their rights are inchoate, and they do not possess the peculiar attributes of sovereignty. Their relation to the general government is very imperfectly defined by the Constitution; and it will be found, upon examination, that in that instrument the only grant of power concerning them is conveyed in the phrase, "Congress shall have the power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations, respecting the territory and other property belonging to the United States." Certainly this phraseology is very loose, if it were designed to include in the grant the whole power of legislation over persons as well as things. The expression, the "territory and other property," fairly construed, relates to the public lands, as such to arsenals, dock-yards, forts, ships and all the various kinds of property, which the United States may and must possess.

But surely the simple authority to dispose of and regulate these, does not extend to the unlimited power of legislation; to the passage of all laws, in the most general acceptation of the word; which by the by, is carefully excluded from the sentence. And indeed, if this were so, it would render unnecessary another provision of the Constitution, which grants to Congress the power to legislate, with the consent of the States, respectively, over all places purchased for the erection of forts, magazines, arsenals, dock-yards, &c. &c. These being the "property" of the United States, if the power to make "needful rules and regulations" concerning them includes the general power of legislation, then the grant of authority

to regulate the "territory and other property of the United States" is unlimited, wherever subjects are found for its operation, and its exercise needed no auxiliary provision. It, on the other hand it does not include such power of legislation, over the "other property" of the U. States, then it does not include it over the "territory," for the same terms which grant the one, grant the other. "Territory" is here classed with property and treated as such, and the object was evidently to enable the general government as a property holder—which from the necessity, it must be to manage, preserve and "dispose of" such property as it might possess, and which authority is essential almost to its being.

But the lives and persons of our citizens with the vast variety of objects connected with them, cannot be controlled by an authority which is merely called into existence for the purpose of making rules and regulations for the disposition and management of property.

Such it appears to me, would be the construction put upon this provision of the constitution, were this question now first presented for consideration, and not controlled by imperious circumstances. The original ordinance of the Congress of the Confederation, passed in 1787, and which was the only act upon this subject in force at the adoption of the constitution, provided a complete frame of government for the country north of the Ohio, while in a territorial condition, and for its eventual admission in separate States, into the Union. And the persuasion, that this ordinance contained within itself all the necessary means of execution, probably prevented any further reference to the subject in the constitution, further than vesting in Congress the right to admit the States formed under it into the Union.

However, circumstances arose, which required legislation, as well over the territory north of the Ohio, as over other territory, both within and without the original Union, ceded to the general government; and, at various times, a more enlarged power has been exercised over the Territories—meaning thereby the different Territorial Governments—than is conveyed by the limited grant referred to. How far an existing necessity may have operated in producing this legislation, and thus extending by tacit consent, I know not, but certain it is, that the principle of interference, should not be carried on beyond the necessary limits, which produces it. It should not be carried on beyond the necessary limits, which produces it. It should not be carried on beyond the necessary limits, which produces it.

Pepper, Spence and other proper governments, and to the necessary provision for their eventual admission into the Union, leaving in the meantime, to the people inhabiting them, to regulate their internal concerns in their own way. They are just as capable of doing so, as the people of the States, and they can do so as their political independence is recognized by a law in the Union. During this territorial condition, it is hardly expedient to carry into execution a doubtful and invidious authority, which questions the intelligence of a respectable portion of our citizens, and whose limitation whatever it may be, will be rapidly approaching its termination; an authority which would give to Congress despotic power, uncontrolled by the constitution, over most important sections of our common country. For if the relation of master and servant may be regulated or annihilated by its legislation, so may the relation of husband and wife, of parent and child, and of any other condition which our institutions and the habits of our society recognize. What would be thought if Congress should undertake to prescribe the terms of marriage in New York or to regulate the authority of parents over their children in Pennsylvania! And yet it would be as vain to seek one justifying the interference of the national legislature in the cases referred to, in the original States of the Union. I speak here of the inherent power of Congress, and do not touch the question of such contracts, as may be formed with new States when admitted into the confederacy.

Of all the questions that can agitate us, those which are merely sectional in their character, are the most dangerous and the most to be deprecated. The warning voice of him who, from his character and services and virtue, had the best right to warn us, proclaimed to his countrymen, in his farewell address—that monument of wisdom for him, as I hope, it will be of safety for them—how much we had to apprehend from measures peculiarly affecting geographical portions of our country. The grave circumstances in which we are now placed, make these words, words of safety; for I am satisfied, from all I have seen and heard here, that a successful attempt to engraft the principles of the Wilmot Provision upon the legislation of this government, and apply them to new territory, to be acquired, would seriously affect our tranquility. I do not suffer myself to forego or foretell the consequences that would ensue; for I trust and believe there is good sense and good feeling enough in the country to avoid them, by avoiding all occasions which might lead to them.

Briefly, then, I am opposed to the exercise of any jurisdiction by Congress over this matter;—and I am in favor of leaving to the people of any territory, which may be hereafter acquired, the right to regulate it for themselves under the general principles of the Constitution. Because,

1. I do not see in the Constitution any grant of the requisite power to Congress; and I am not disposed to extend a doubtful precedent beyond its necessary—the establishment of territorial governments when needed—leaving to the inhabitants all the rights compatible with the relations they bear to the confederacy.

2. Because I believe this measure, if adopted, would weaken, if not impair, the union of the States, and would sow the seeds of future discord, which would grow up and ripen into an abundant harvest of calamity.

3. Because I believe a general conviction, that such a proposition would succeed, would lead to an immediate withholding of the supplies, and thus to a dishonorable termination of the war. I think no dispassionate observer, at the seat of government, can doubt this result.

4. If, however, in this I am under a misapprehension, I am under none in the practical operation of this restriction, if adopted by Congress, upon a treaty of peace making any acquisition of Mexican territory. Such a treaty would be rejected, certainly as presented to the Senate. More than one—

5. Because I believe as an act against the States from a participation in the benefits acquired by the treasure and exertions of all, and which should be common to all. I am repeat-

—neither advancing nor defending these views. That branch of the subject does not lie in my way, and I shall not turn aside to seek it.

In this aspect of the matter, the people of the U. States must choose between this restriction, and the extension of their territorial limits. They cannot have both; and which they will surrender must depend upon their representatives first, and then, if these fail them, upon themselves.

5. But after all, it seems to be generally conceded, that this restriction, if carried into effect, could not operate upon any States formed from newly acquired territory. The well-known attributes of sovereignty, recognised by us as belonging to the State Governments, would sweep before them any such barrier, and would leave the people to express and exert their will at pleasure. Is the object, then, of temporary exclusion for so short a period as the duration of the territorial governments, worth the price at which it would be purchased—worth the discord it would engender, the trial to which it would expose our Union, and the evils that would be the certain consequence, let that trial result as it might? As to the course, which has been intimated rather than proposed, of engraving such a restriction upon any treaty of acquisition, I persuade myself it would find but little favor in any portion of this country. Such an arrangement would render Mexico a party, having a right to interfere in our internal institutions in questions left by the constitution to the State governments, and would inflict a serious blow upon our fundamental principles. Few indeed, I trust, there are among us, who would thus grant to a foreign power the right to inquire into the constitution and conduct of the sovereign States of this Union; and if there are any, I am not among them, and never shall be.

To the people of this country, under God, now and hereafter, are its destinies committed; and we want no foreign power to interfere in our treaty in hand, and to say—Why have you done this, or why have you left that undone? Our own dignity and the principles of national independence unite to repel such a proposition.

But there is another important consideration, which ought not to be lost sight of in the investigation of this subject. The question that presents itself, is not a question of the measure but of a diffusion of slavery. Whether its sphere be stationary or progressive, its amount will be the same. The rejection of this restriction will be no addition to the class of servitude, nor will its adoption give freedom to a single being who is now placed therein. The same numbers will be spread over greater territory; and so far as comfort, pressure, with less abundance of the necessities of life, is an evil, so far will that evil be mitigated by transporting slaves to a new country, and giving them a larger space to occupy.

I say this in the event of the extension of slavery over any new acquisition. But can it go there? This may well be doubted. All the descriptions which reach us, of the condition of the California and of New Mexico, to the acquisition of which our efforts seem at present directed, unite in representing those countries as agricultural regions, similar in their products to our middle States, and generally unfit for the production of the great staples, which can alone render slave labor valuable. It is not grossly deceived—and it is difficult to conceive how we can be—the inhabitants of those regions, whether they depend upon their ploughs or their herds, cannot be slaveholders. Involuntary labor, requiring the investment of large capital, can only be profitable when employed in the production of a few favored articles confined by nature to special districts, and paying larger returns than the usual agricultural products spread over more considerable portions of the earth.

In the able letter of Mr. Buchanan upon this subject, not long since given to the public, he presents similar considerations with great force. "Neither," says the distinguished writer, "the soil, the climate, nor the productions of California south of 36 deg. 30 min. are adapted to slave labor; and besides every facility would be there afforded for the slave to escape from his master. Such property would be entirely insecure in any part of California. It is morally impossible, therefore, that a majority of the emigrants to that portion of the territory south of 36 deg. 30 min., which will be chiefly composed of our citizens, will ever re-establish slavery within its limits."

In regard to New Mexico, east of the Rio Grande, the question has already been settled by the admission of Texas into the Union.

"Should we acquire territory beyond the Rio Grande and east of the Rocky Mountains, it is still more impossible that a majority of the people would consent to re-establish slavery. They are themselves a colored population, and among them the negro does not belong socially to a degraded race."

With this remark Mr. Walker fully coincides in his letter written in 1844, upon the annexation of Texas, and which every where produced so favorable an impression upon the public mind, as to have conducted very materially to the accomplishment of that great measure. "Beyond the Del Norte," says Mr. Walker, "slavery is not past; not only because it is forbidden by law, but because the colored race there preponderates in the ratio of ten to one over the whites; and holding as they do, the government and most of the offices in their possession, they will not permit the enslavement of any portion of the colored race, which makes and executes the laws of the country."

The question, it will be therefore seen, on examination, does not regard the exclusion of slavery from a region where it now exists, but a prohibition against its introduction where it does not exist, and where, from the feelings of the inhabitants and the laws of nature, it is morally impossible," as Mr. Buchanan says, that it can ever re-establish itself.

It augurs well for the permanence of our confederacy, that during more than half a century, which has elapsed since the establishment of this government, many serious questions, and some of them of the highest importance, have agitated the public mind, and more than once threatened the gravest consequences; but that they have all in succession passed away, leaving our institutions unscathed, and our country advancing in numbers, power, and wealth, and in all the other elements of national prosperity, with a rapidity unknown in ancient or in modern days. In times of political excitement, when difficult and delicate questions present themselves for solution, there is one rule of safety for us; and that is an adherence to the fundamental principles of our

difficulties. This course of proceeding, has carried us in safety through many a trouble, and I trust will carry us safely through many more, should many more be destined to assail us. The Wilmot provision seeks to take from its legitimate tribunal a question of domestic policy having no relation to the Union, as such, and to transfer it to another created by the people for a special purpose, and foreign to the subject-matter involved in this issue. By going back to our true principles, we go back to the road of peace and safety. Leave to the people, who will be affected by this question, to adjust it upon their own responsibility, and in their own manner, and we shall render another tribute to the original principles of our government, and furnish another guaranty for its permanence and prosperity.

I am, dear sir, respectfully,
Your obedient servant,
LEWIS CASS.

A. O. P. NICHOLSON, Esq., Nashville, Tenn.

From the Washington Union.

A CALL FOR INFORMATION.

We lay before our readers the following interesting and well-written letter which we received by yesterday's mail from Connecticut. In submitting this paper to the country, we are aware of the importance of its contents; and we call, in the name of the people, for an answer from either Mr. Bites, Mr. Baldwin, or Mr. Truman Smith. They cannot evade it. They cannot shirk, dodge, or shun a reply; and whatever it be, it must be as clear, unequivocal, trumpet-tongued, as any which ever emanated from the lips of man. Whatever it be, we pledge ourselves to publish it. We want the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. We want to know what are General Taylor's decided opinions upon this delicate question. We want to know whether it is possible that General Taylor can write letters, which are thus to operate in the dark upon one section of the country, to the exclusion and in derogation of another. We have no quarrel with him in this business; but, for one, we are determined to meet out the truth. We have no quarrel to interfere with the slightest degree of respect; but we will not rest until they are compelled to speak out. If such a letter is ever published, it concerns the public interest, as deeply as it concerns some department of ordinary home and life etiquette. Gen. Taylor's letter is the only evidence, perhaps, that can fairly be put in the public mind; and we most respectfully call for it. We shall address a copy of this number of the Union to the three gentlemen specified by our correspondent. If they fail to answer, we shall repeat the call once a week—until that call shall fall like the "statue's" note upon the public ear.

NEW HAVEN, (Ct.) August 22, 1848.

To the Editor of the Union:

A tough and personally acquainted with you, yet I take the liberty to enclose to you an extract from a newspaper published here this morning. It is from the New Haven Journal. This paper is edited by that veteran writer Thomas G. Woodard, who is the intimate and confidential friend of Roger S. Baldwin, the abolition federal slave or foe in this State, who resides in Haverhill, and the paper is known, and has been for many years, as his organ.

Whatever importance you in Washington may attach to it, there is more in it, I can tell you, than appears on its face. Senator Baldwin, and the Hon. Truman Smith of the House of Representatives, arrived in this city on Wednesday last. This is in this section a large portion of the whigs who would not, hitherto, support the nomination of Gen. Taylor; and, from appearances, were going to join the "free soilers;" and, in fact, had sent delegates to the Buffalo Convention. Since Senator Baldwin's arrival, the most extraordinary exertions are making to whip in the disaffected whigs to the support of Gen. Taylor; and in a good many instances, they have been successful. A copy of a letter from General Taylor is exhibited by Mr. Baldwin to these disaffected whigs; the original of which is now in the possession (as Mr. Baldwin says) of Wm. G. Bates of Massachusetts, one of the delegates from that State to the Whig National Convention, and who, after the convention, spent some time in Washington. In this letter, Gen. Taylor pledges himself that he will not veto any measure that has passed both houses of Congress, and annex particularly to the Wilmot Provision. No copies of this letter will Gov. Baldwin give to any person, as was undoubtedly agreed upon at Washington among the whig members from the North and West before the adjournment. This is, no doubt, from the fear that it might be published, and thus injure Gen. Taylor at the South.

Mr. Baldwin has given the following as the way in which this pledge was obtained from Taylor. He says that Corwin and others from Ohio, and some of the Massachusetts whigs, and others from the North, would not go in for Taylor until they could have a pledge of this kind; that a special messenger was despatched from Washington to Gen. Taylor, with letters from Mr. Corwin and others, and with the letter in reply he sent of a "yes" or "no" character, and the original of the letter was sent to him.

It is not necessary that the same gentleman should be the messenger of Lincoln, who should be the messenger of Taylor. He is there to make such use of them as you may deem proper under the circumstances. Will not our southern friends open their eyes?

In the greatest possible haste, your friend.

From the New Haven Journal.

We publish the above communication very willingly, because, in its hearty opposition to slavery, we sympathize. But no one can doubt that, who glances over our columns from day to day. We have said expressly, over and over again, that the time was coming, and at no distant day, when the whole North would plant herself on the ground of "no slavery," and stand to it to a man. We do not, however, at present, feel that matters are ripe for this. When they are, our correspondent may count on our support. At present we feel that the great whig party are certain to come into power with Gen. Taylor at their head; and we have all confidence, that the moment Congress shall pass a law to "re-inscribe the 'untimely' curse"

within the limits of the constitution, as interpreted by Daniel Webster and others of our ablest northern men, that moment such a bill will receive Taylor's signature. Convince us that it will not, and we will pull down his name from our paper.

What we say again, then, does our friend "freeman" want, that we cannot give him? Does he want any stronger opposition to slavery? But where will he find it, asserted over and over again, in our columns long before the Buffalo Convention? And we say now, that we are ready for any and all movements, just and proper, to confine the evil within limits dictated by right. But we think that there is a power already working for this end, and that power and that spirit are the body and spirit of the whig party. This party has ever been for justice and truth; it is for that now; and the instant the time comes to cut the head from the monster, the whigs will do it. Does "freeman" want more?

Or is it, after all, that he does not believe that with Gen. Taylor we can do this? and does he think we are deceived in Gen. Taylor?

This, however, we will attend to tomorrow, as we have another communication touching this subject, which we will then and there publish and comment upon at length.

Our friend, "freeman," will find us as good as anti-slavery men as he is; but as for swallowing a Dutchman with it—bah!

TAYLORISM IN NORTH CAROLINA.

The Standard, printed at the Capitol of North Carolina has the following article on the subject of the recent elections in that State:

"TAYLORISM DEAD!—Whatever the result of the late elections may turn out to be in this State, one thing is certain, a death-blow has been given to the prospects of Gen. Taylor for the Presidency. Gen. Taylor, we were told, was to be elected the whig majority in this 'confined' whig State, the mere use of his name was to carry defeat, dismay, and consternation into the ranks of the Democrats. 'Ah, gentlemen, that was a great mistake!' Cass, Butler, Rind, principles, and Democracy have made the gains; and the enthusiasm has been shown to be—as we said it was, more than a month ago—all on our side. Look at those poor-thing—those empire counties, Guilford and Orange, with their Whig losses, and their gains to the Democracy of more than 5000 votes! What does that mean?"

"And it Southern Whigs will not stand up to Gen. Taylor and Millard Fillmore, what may be expected of Northern Whigs? The main argument here was, when we asked the whig leaders for Gen. Taylor's principles, 'he is sound upon the slavery question, because he resides in a slave-holding State.' That was the argument—the result is before the world. If that argument would not do here, will it do in the North? Will Southern Whigs—Wilmot Provisors and District of Columbia—support Gen. Taylor, because he is supposed to be favorable to slaveholding interests?"

"We repeat, whatever the result has been in this State, the simple fact that Gen. Taylor has given no strength to the Whigs in the late contest, will fall like a thunderbolt upon the Whig party throughout the Union. When North Carolina shall have been fully heard from, we believe that no whig in the Confederacy will be able to penetrate the gloom that hangs upon his path. Darkness—thick darkness—settles on the Whig banner, and disappointment and mortification may be read in all Whig countenances. Gentlemen, Taylorism is dead!"

Very true—it is the appeals of the whigs of the South in behalf of Gen. Taylor as a slaveholder, and hence his interest identified with theirs, would not answer for that region, without a platform of principles, what must the effect be in the North, where such a cry of slave-holding interest, must produce even a worse effect.

The recent elections from all parts of the Union show that Gen. Taylor is the weakest candidate the federal party ever nominated. The truth is, the whig party is literally dissolved, and the great cry among the rank and file is, in the language of Daniel Webster, on another occasion, where shall I go?

GEN. TAYLOR'S DIFFERENT LIVES.—Who would have supposed after all the fuss made in and out of Congress by whig speakers, whig newspapers, and whig scribblers and spouters generally, over the two editions of the life of Cass published at the Globe office, that the same objection could be brought with much more force against Gen. Taylor?—

Gen. Taylor has in our possession two different lives of Gen. Taylor, neither of them containing any political matter; but in Washington City it seems the whig committee are engaged in enlightening the people as to the old general's political principles, and are sending different versions to different sections of the country. The Hon. J. P. Stanton in a speech recently delivered in Congress, makes the following allusion to the character and contents of the northern life. He has the southern edition, such as has been handed to leading whigs in this section of the country containing no letter of Truman Smith, James Hamilton Davis, Rev. Mr. Lamb or any of those kind of anti-slavery documents. But hear Mr. Stanton, the eloquent and chivalrous Tennesseean on the subject.

Mr. Speaker, I have heard much said of the two editions of the life of Gen. Cass published at the Globe office in this city. Gentlemen have endeavored to make some political capital out of an imaginary fraud pretended to have been discovered in those two publications. But in truth there was no material difference, and certainly nothing contradictory, in the character of the documents. They were not designed for different sections of the country; and no certain knowledge, they were sent indiscriminately to all quarters.

Be this as it may, however, one would suppose that the party which raised such a clamor upon this trifling discovery could not themselves be guilty of the slightest impropriety of a similar kind. An honest man might be justly surprised, if, after this, he should find any fraud attempted to be perpetrated by the Whigs. Now, sir, if you will step down stairs in the folding-room of this Capitol, you will find thousands of a certain document there, in preparation for distribution, which I will warrant was never designed to be read in the South. Here is the title of this precious pamphlet: "Please circulate." REASONS GOOD AND TRUE FOR SUPPORTING THE NOMINATION OF GEN. ZACHARY TAYLOR. In looking over this document, I find that it contains the letter of a distinguished Senator for Massachusetts,

generally known as "honest" J. It contains a celebrated letter of a man from Connecticut. [Tick last but not least, comes an appendix of a certain Rev. Mr. La figure extensively. In that letter he gives following account of General Taylor's opinion.

"With regard to slavery, and extension of territory, I assure you, that neither for a slave-holder, nor any other object was Gen. Taylor in favor of conquest and annexation. He was not in favor of receiving Texas into our Union, nor in favor of the recent war with Mexico. The only evidence of his being in favor of slavery, that I ever saw or heard of, was the fact that he did allow every man at the south must do, if he would have servants, viz: either own or hire slaves. I do well remember that a part at least of the colored people living in his family could read well, and were very pious. I never heard a word from the General in favor of the slave system, but on the contrary, his decided preference for the institutions and customs of the North."

"It is a pity that Gen. Taylor should be made out a pro-slavery man because his Government keeps him at the South, or for the wrong of allowing his plantation to be on the Mississippi, instead of the banks of the Connecticut."

"I assure you that, if elected, he would be allowed to do."

Here, sir, is a statement of one of those hypocrites, who do not hesitate to pervert the influence of their sacred office to the foulest purposes, endorsed and sent out from this Capital by thousands, under the rank of members of Congress. For what market are these missiles in? Will any portion of them be sent into slaveholding States? No one! Will you tell the southern people, that Gen. Taylor is a "decided preference for the institutions and customs of the North?" Will you insult them by the assertions, that a man who owns two or three hundred slaves is not a pro-slavery man, because his Government keeps him at the South, and he is therefore obliged to be a slaveholder, against his own pious inclination? No sir! You will not publish these things in the South. The reverend author of them knows too well in what latitude they will flourish best, and bear most fruit. And those who send forth these papers from this Capitol have a very clear instinct as to the direction which should be given to them. Yes, sir, this is only a legitimate part of that game of deception by which either the North or the South, or both are to be cheated and defrauded, if possible, in the coming election. Southern men will not answer for Gen. Taylor's opinions; northern men assert their belief that he will not veto a bill containing the "Wilmot proviso." What northern man on this floor has yet denied this, or will dare to do so?

But, Mr. Speaker, there is another prominent passage, whose opinions on this subject are avowed, and whose opinions on the "Wilmot proviso" are asserted to be in favor of it. And I now call upon any gentleman—any man who is a neighbor of Mr. Fillmore, and who knows his opinions well. I challenge any one of them to rise here and deny what I have asserted. I pause for a reply. No man denies it. I challenge any northern man to say that he does not believe this of Mr. Fillmore. Not one of you ventures to deny it.

I now ask any southern man to deny that I have truly stated Mr. Fillmore's opinions. You are silent.

From the Union.

A MISTAKE TRULY—DUTY OF DEMOCRATS.

The Whigs never committed a grosser blunder than in passing over Mr. Clay and selecting General Taylor as their standard bearer. The name of Clay was calculated to produce enthusiasm in their ranks—that of General Taylor produces none. At the time he was taken up by the Whigs, his victories produced great exultation. But the Whigs are like the passengers standing upon the banks of the river; whilst they are exulting it to rise, its waters are going out. The time four years ago, the whole country was excited; the Whigs were straining every nerve to elect their candidate. They were even confident of his election. It was because the name of Henry Clay was inscribed upon their banner. If they had not committed the egregious blunder, which has now produced their selection—and had they adopted Henry Clay as their master spirit and their standard-bearer, the whole country would again have been rocking with the enthusiasm of their party. But there is nothing in the character of General Taylor (except his literary fame, which is now rivalled, if not eclipsed by that of other generals) to excite the party to enthusiasm. Nothing in his political talents—nothing in his civil reputation—nothing in his attainments, to rouse their own pride or the admiration of the people. He is no known and devoted Whig. His whole conduct has been inconsistent. There is nothing in it to command the slightest confidence. At one time it is no party man; at another time he is. At one moment he cordially accepts the non-national Whig Convention; and the next he decries that he would have been willing to accept nomination of the Democratic Convention of 1840—perhaps even that of the Buffalo Convention. How, we repeat, can any such candidate excite any enthusiasm among the people, or receive the entire confidence of his own party? If the Whigs, therefore, have blundered in him up, he has been equally unfortunate in means he has selected for securing the election of a great people.

But whilst we throw out these views, must caution our own friends against indulging in an overweening confidence. It is never to despise the strength of our adversary. To strain every nerve—wisely organized and judiciously art. We must succeed if we follow our duty.

Whig Enthusiasm.

"Is this the keg," he said,
With mouth like yawning chasm,
Which once was filled, up to the top,
With whig enthusiasm?
Its hollow sound denotes
The emptiness within;
'Tis like our leaders, when men
Their patriotic din!"

STELLA.